DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 123 CG 024 116

TITLE Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined,

and Drug-Free Schools. Contractor Report. E.D.

Tabs.

INSTITUTION Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.

SPONS AGENCY National Center for Education Statistics (ED),

Washington, DC.

REPORT NO ISBN-0-16-036198-2; NCES-92-008

PUB DATE Apr 92

NOTE 47p.; For teacher survey, see ED 338 996.

AVAILABLE FROM U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of

Documents, Mail Stop SSOP, Washington, DC

20402-9328.

PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation

Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Discipline Policy; *Drinking; *Drug Education; *Drug

Use; Elementary Secondary Education; National

Surveys; *Public Schools; School Policy;

*Superintendents

IDENTIFIERS Drug Free Schools

ABSTRACT

This report is the third in a series presenting results from surveys on safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The introduction notes that the data were obtained from a survey of 739 public school superintendents. Among the highlighted results are the following: (1) nearly all public school districts were found to have written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use; (2) school principals and teachers were involved in these policies in over 90 percent of school districts surveyed; (3) the average number of hours drug use education was taught in each grade during the 1990-91 school year ranged from about 14 hours in kindergarten through third grade to about 20 hours in grades 4 through 6,, 21 hours in grades 7 through 9, and 18 hours in grades 10 through 12; (4) drug use education is offered in a variety of different ways; (5) more than 80 percent of the districts teach students about causes and effects of alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, how to resist peer pressure, and school alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies and enforcement; (6) police provided assistance or educational support to a great extent in promoting safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, according to 42 percent of public school district superintendents; and (7) suspensions occurred on average about 26 times for every 1,000 students per public school district. (LLL)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

05

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

E.D. TABS

April 1992

Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools

Contractor Report



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

- Limit e of Educational Research and Improvement EDUC ATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
- This document has been reproduced as included from the person or organization unumating if
- (* Minut changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Proints of view or opinions stated in this doc ument, do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement

NCES 92-008



NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

E.D. TABS

April 1992

Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools

Contractor Report



Judi Carpenter Elementary/Secondary Education Statistics Division National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement

NCES 92-008



U.S. Department of Education

Lamar Alexander Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Diane Ravitch
Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics

Emerson J. Elliott Acting Commissioner

National Center for Education Statistics

"The purpose of the Center shall be to collect, and analyze, and disseminate statistics and other data related to education in the United States and in other nations."—Section 406(b) of the General Education Provializes Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1).

April 1992

Contact: Judi Carpenter (202) 219–1333



Highlights

The following are highlights from a national survey of over 700 district superintendents. Data are weighted to produce national estimates. Some differences among various types of districts are noted, though this publication does not present all such differences.

- Nearly all public school districts (97 to 98 percent) have written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use (Table 1).
- Less than 1 year ago, 35 to 38 percent of public school districts significantly changed their alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies (Table 2). Thirty-one percent significantly changed their general discipline policy.
- Public school principals and teachers were involved in the development of general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies in over 90 percent of school districts. Parents were involved in the development of these policies in over 70 percent and students in over 50 percent of school districts (Table 2).
- A student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey has been conducted in the last 2 years by 61 percent of public school districts (Table 1). Fewer districts in the Northeast (39 percent) conducted a survey than in other regions, and fewer small districts (58 percent) than large districts (75 percent) conducted a survey.
- The average number of hours drug use education was taught in each grade during the 1990-91 school year ranged from about 14 hours in kindergarten through third grade to about 20 hours in grades 4 through 6 to 21 hours in grades 7 through 9, and to approximately 18 hours in grades 10 through 12 (Table 5).
- Drug use education is offered in a variety of different ways in public school districts. About 90 percent of districts offered drug use education within the health curriculum, and about 90 percent offered it at special assemblies or events at the elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels (Table 6).
- Superintendents were asked to indicate what proportion of schools in their district included various components in their drug use education programs/activities. More than 80 percent of public school districts included the following at all schools within the district: teaching students about causes and effects of alcohol, drug, and tobacco use; teaching students to resist peer pressure; school alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies/enforcement; and referrals for counseling and treatment (Table 7). Student drug-testing programs at all schools within the district were reported by only 8 percent of public school districts.
- Police provided assistance or educational support to a great extent in promoting safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, according to 42 percent of public school district superintendents (Table 9). About 20 percent indicated that parent groups and social service agencies provided the same level of support.
- Suspensions because of disruptive behavior occurred on average about 26 times for every 1,000 students per public school district during the fall 1990 semester. On average, there were 2 student transfers to alternative schools for every 1,000 students and 1 expulsion for every 1,000 students during the same time period for disruptive behavior (Table 11).
- Superintendents were asked to report the number of suspensions, transfers to alternative schools, and expulsions administered for every 1,000 students due to drug use, possession, or sales. There was an average of 1.9 suspensions, 0.4 transfers to alternative schools, and 0.2 expulsions during the fall 1990 semester (Table 12).



Table of Contents

Section		Page
Highlights		iii
Introduction	on to the Data	1
Definition	S	2
Tables		3
Distri	ct Policies	
1	Percentage of public school districts with written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and percentage of public school districts that have conducted a student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey within the last 2 years, by district characteristics. United States. 1990-91	s: 4
2	Percentage of public school districts indicating when their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly, and the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain groups were involved in the development of these policies: United States, 1990-91	5
3	Percentage of public school districts indicating that their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly less than 1 year ago, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	6
Drug	Use Education	
4	Average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	7
5	Average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade span during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	7
6	Percentage of public school districts offering drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education through different approaches at each instructional level, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	8
7	Percentage of public school districts indicating in how many schools certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities: United States, 1990-91	9
8	Percentage of public school districts indicating that certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities in all or most schools, by size and location of district: United States, 1990-91	10



Table of Contents--continued

Section	n		Page
Tab	lescon	tinued	
	Comm	unity Support	
	9	Percentage of public school districts indicating the extent to which various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the extent to which various types of assistance are provided by these organizations: United States, 1990-91	11
	10	Percentage of public school districts indicating that to a great or moderate extent various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the percentage indicating that to a great or moderate extent various types of assistance are provided by these organizations: United States, 1990-91	12
	Discipl	linary Actions	
	11	Total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for disruptive behavior during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	13
	12	Total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for student alcohol and drug use, possession, or sales during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	14
Tex	ct Tables	s	
	A	Number and percentage of public school districts in the study sample and the estimated number and percentage in the nation, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	3
	В	Number of public school districts in the study sample that responded, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	16
Sur	vey Me	thodology and Data Reliability	15
		Sample Selection Response Rates Sampling and Nonsampling Errors Variances Background Information	15 15 16 17 18



Table of Contents--continued

Section	1		Page
App	endix A	A: Standard Error Tables	19
	Distric	t Policies	
	1a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts with written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and percentage of public school districts that have conducted a student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey within the last 2 years, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	21
	2a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating when their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly, and the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain groups were involved in the development of these policies: United States, 1990-91	e S
	3a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly less than 1 year ago, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	23
	Drug U	Jse Education	
	4a	Standard errors of the average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	3 24
	5a	Standard errors of the average number of hours drugs (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade span during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	25
	ба	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts offering drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education through different approaches at each instructional level, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	26
	7a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating in how many schools certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities: United States, 1990-91	
	8a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities in all or most schools, by size and location of district: United States, 1990-91	28



Table of Contents--continued

Section			Page
Stand	lard Er	rror Tablescontinued	
(Commi	unity Support	
•		Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating the extent to which various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the extent to which various types of assistance are provided by these organizations: United States, 1990-91	, 29
	10a	Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that to a great or moderate extent various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the percentage indicating that to a great or moderate extent various types of assistance are provided by these organizations, by size and location of district: United States, 1990-91	
	Discipl	inary Actions	
	11a	Standard errors of the total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for disruptive behavior during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	31
	12a	Standard errors of the total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for student alcohol and drug use, possession, or sales during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91	32
Anni	endix B	3: Ouestionnaire	33



Introduction to the Data

This report is the third in a series of three E.D. TABS presenting results from three surveys on safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The statistics represent public school district superintendents' perspectives on issues related to safety, discipline, and drug use prevention in public elementary and secondary schools. A national sample of 790 public school district superintendents was selected; 739 of these superintendents responded to questions concerning the extent of discipline p. blems within schools, the nature and effectiveness of current policies and drug education programs, and disciplinary actions.

To the extent that student alcohol and drug use, violence, and disruptive behavior are problems facing schools, they are impediments to learning. To address such problems, the nation's Governors and the President endorsed a set of National Education Goals to be reached by the year 2000. National Education Goal Six calls for all schools in America to be free of drugs and violence and to offer a safe, disciplined environment conducive to learning. To achieve the goal, policymakers, educators, and the public need information about the current status of the nation's schools and the extent to which the goal's various objectives are being met.

The tabular summaries in this report are based on data collected from the District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The survey was conducted by Westat, Inc., a research firm in Rockville, Maryland, through the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). FRSS was designed to provide data on policy-related issues regarding emerging educational developments. The tables present data for all public school districts and for districts by type of school location (urban, suburban, rural), enrollment size (less than 2,500, 2,500 to 9,999, 10,000 or more), region (Northeast, Central, Southeast, and West), and percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches (10 percent or less, 11 to 40 percent, 41 percent or more). Statistics in all tables are based on national estimates (see Table A).

The statistics from the two related surveys have been published: an E.D. TABS report on the Teacher Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools (NCES 91-091) and an E.D. TABS report on the Principal Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools (NCES 92-007). Reports integrating all three surveys will be developed during 1992.



Definitions

Common Core of Data Public School Universe — A data tape containing 84,968 records, one for each public elementary and secondary school in the 50 States, District of Columbia, and five outlying areas, as reported to the National Center for Education Statistics by the State education agencies. Records on this file contain the name, address, and telephone number of the school, name of the school district or other agency that operates the school, school type and locale, the full-time-equivalent number of classroom teachers assigned to the school, the number of students eligible for the federal free-lunch program, and membership, by grade and racial/ethnic categories.

Urban — Primarily serves a central city of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

Suburban — Serves an MSA, but not primarily its central city.

Rural — Does not serve an MSA.

Full-time-equivalent (FTE) — Amount of time required to perform an assignment stated as a proportion of a full-time position and computed by dividing the amount of time employed by the time normally required for a full-time position.

Drug use education — Refers to learning activities and related policies to prevent or reduce alcohol, drug (e.g., marijuana, inhalants, cocaine), and tobacco use by youth. It does <u>not</u> include clinical treatr ent or rehabilitation.

Disruptive behavior — Refers to serious and/or unlawful actions that may interfere with order in school (e.g., physical attacks, property destruction, thefts). Alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution are reported separately on the FRSS questionnaire and are not included under "disruptive behavior."

Northeast region — Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Central region — Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Southeast region — Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

West region — Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Percentage of students receiving federally funded free or reduced-price lunches — data used as an approximate measure of socioeconomic status.



Table A.--Number and percentage of public school districts in the study sample and the estimated number and percentage in the nation, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

	San	ple	National estimate*			
District characteristic	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
All districts	739	100	15,500	100		
Location of district						
Urban	138	19	700	4		
Suburban	337	46	5,700	37		
Rural	264	36	9,100	59		
Enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	264	36	11,900	77		
2,500 to 9,999	257	35	2,900	19		
10,000 or more	218	30	700	4		
Region						
Northeast	150	20	3,100	20		
Central	210	28	6,000	39		
Southeast	170	23	1,700	11		
West	209	28	4,700	30		
Percentage of students						
receiving free or						
reduced-price lunches						
10 percent or less	134	18	2,800	18		
11 to 40 percent	400	54	8,300	53		
41 percent or more	191	26	3,800	25		
Not available	14	2	600	4		

^{*}Data presented in all tables are weighted to produce national estimates. See Survey Methodology and Data Reliability Section for more information on sampling procedures (page 15).

NOTE: Percents may not sum to 100 and numbers may not sum to totals because of rounding.



Table 1.--Percentage of public school districts with written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and percentage of public school districts that have conducted a student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey within the last 2 years, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic		Written p	Conducted student alcohol drug, or tobacco		
District characteristic	General discipline	Alcohol	Drug	Tobacco	use survey in the last 2 years
Ail districts	98	98	98	97	61
Location of district					
Urban	100	99	100	99	67
Suburban	100	98	98	96	56
Rural	96	98	98	97	64
Enrollment size					
Less than 2,500	97	98	98	96	58
2,500 to 9,999	100	100	100	98	70
10,000 or more	99	99	99	98	75
Region					
Northeast	96	96	96	92	39
Central	100	99	99	99	66
Southeast	100	99	99	99	66
West	94	98	98	97	68
Percentage of students					
receiving free or					
remaced-price lunches					
10 percent or less	100	98	98	95	56
11 to 40 percent	99	97	9 7	9 7	60
41 percent or more	100	100	100	99	65



Table 2.--Percentage of public school districts indicating when their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly, and the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain groups were involved in the development of these policies: United States, 1990-91

District response	General discipline policy	Alcohol policy*	Drug policy*	Tobacco policy*
Last changed significantly				
Less than 1 year ago	31	35	38	38
1-3 years ago	42	50	50	46
More than 3 years ago	27	16	12	16
Involved in policy development				
Involved in policy development State Department of Education	56	63	67	60
State Department of Education	56 96	63 96	67 96	60 95
State Department of Education		- -	- ·	
	96	96	96	95
State Department of Education	96 96	96 94	96 95	95 94
State Department of Education Principals Teachers	96 96 79	96 94 77	96 95 77	95 94 73

^{*}For districts in which alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were included in a single policy, respondents were asked to describe each component separately.

NOTE: Percents for "Last changed significantly" are computed down each column, but may not sum to 100 because of rounding. Percents for "Involved in policy development" do not sum to 100 because more than one group could be involved in developing district policy.



Table 3.—Percentage of public school districts indicating that their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly less than 1 year ago, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic	General discipline policy	Alcohol policy	Drug policy	Tobacco policy
All districts	31	35	38	38
Location of district				
Urban	50	48	49	54
Suburban	30	40	42	36
Rural	30	30	35	38
Enrollment size				
Less than 2,500	33	36	40	40
2,500 to 9,999	24	29	31	29
10,000 or more	30	32	32	32
Region				
Northeast	33	33	35	36
Central	31	38	41	33
Southeast	34	25	33	34
West	29	35	37	47
Percentage of students receiving				
free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	40	45	46	41
11 to 40 percent	27	34	3"	39
41 percent or more	31	30	34	35



Table 4.--Average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic			•			(Grade						
District characteristic	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
All districts	11.8	13.6	13.9	14.7	17.6	20.0	21.0	22.3	21.6	20.2	20.2	16.5	16.5

Table 5.--Average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade span during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic		Grade	e span	
	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Il districts	13.5	19.5	21.2	17.7
ocation of district				
Urban	9.1	17.4	14.8	12.1
Suburban	12.6	19.3	20.9	16.4
Rural	14.4	19.8	21.8	18.9
inrollment size				
Less than 2,500	13 3	19.5	21.8	18.6
2,500 to 9,999	12.9	19.9	19.9	16. 0
10,000 or more	12.4	17.9	17.3	13.3
Region				
Northeast	14.6	19.5	21.0	20.3
Central	13.1	18.3	22.2	16.9
Southeast	19.6	22.1	22.1	19.5
West	11.1	20.2	19.3	16.5
Percentage of students				
ecciving free or				
educed-price lunches				
10 percent or less	11.1	18.9	17.8	12.9
11 to 40 percent	14.7	19.4	22.2	18.4
41 percent or more	13.2	18.2	21.6	19.8



Table 6.--Percentage of public school districts offering drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education through different approaches at each instructional level, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

		Vithin heal curriculun		1	/ithin scienc		se	As a parate cour	se	4	Throughou e curriculu		At sp	occial assen	nblies
District characteristic	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Sr. High	Jr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High
All districts	89	88	92	62	71	64	29	28	22	67	64	62	89	91	91
Location of district															
Urban	66	82	80	42	65	50	49	25	20	52	59	63	91	91	80
Suburban	90	88	90	64	71	57	29	25	20	64	57	56	91	93	90
Rural	90	88	94	61	71	69	28	29	23	69	69	66	88	90	92
Enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	89	88	93	62	71	65	28	27	21	66	65	64	88	89	90
2,500 to 9,999	91	89	90	62	71	62	33	28	25	67	61	58	92	96	94
10,000 or more	85	85	88	53	67	65	37	30	24	68	58	56	92	94	96
Region															
Northeast	91	91	94	61	70	53	31	29	22	65	63	56	91	93	92
Central	87	90	95	64	7 0	66	24	26	21	72	67	68	88	89	91
Southeast	94	94	95	74	8.5	82	23	21	17	74	69	69	95	97	96
West	87	80	85	54	66	59	38	31	27	57	58	53	88	90	88
Percentage of students receiving free or reduced-															
10 percent or less	86	90	85	67	72	57	35	42	35	63	65	66	92	94	92
11 to 40 percent	86	91	94	60	69	61	29	24	18	36	63	60	86	88	90
41 percent or more	94	78	91	64	72	76	19	25	22	71	69	66	94	94	91

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 40, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1992.



17

 ∞

Table 7.—Percentage of public school districts indicating in how many schools certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities: United States, 1990-91

Education program/activities component	All schools	Most schools	Some schools	No schools
Teaching students about causes and effects of alcohol, drug, and tobacco use	96	4	(+)	0
Teaching students about laws regarding alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution	78	16	5	1
Teaching students to resist peer pressure	88	9	3	0
Peer counseling	35	13	29	23
School alcohol, drug, and tobacco policy/				
enforcement	87	7	4	2
Student assistance programs (SAPs)	41	9	20	30
School services for high-risk students	67	8	15	10
Referrals to counseling and treatment	81	9	9	2
Student drug-testing programs	8	1	4	87

⁽⁺⁾ Less than 0.5.

NOTE: Percents are computed across each row, but may not sum to 100 because of rounding.



Table 8.—Percentage of public school districts indicating that certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities in all or most schools, by size and location of district: United States, 1930-91

			Enrollment	size	Location of district			
Education program/ activities component	Total	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Teaching students about causes and effects of alcohol, drug, and tobacco use	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Teaching students about laws regarding alcohol.								
drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales,			21	03	00	95	93	
and distribution	94	94	91	93	99			
Teaching students to resist peer pressure	97	97	97	98	99	98	96	
Peer counseling	48	51	38	38	31	43	52	
School alcohol, drug, and tobacco policy/								
enforcement	94	94	93	97	98	92	95	
Student assistance programs (SAPs)	51	51	48	52	43	47	53	
School services for high-risk students	75	75	74	87	72	75	76	
Referrals to counseling and treatment		91	85	88	73	89	91	
Student drug-testing programs	9	10	6	5	9	11	8	



Table 9.—Percentage of public school districts indicating the extent to which various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the extent to which various types of assistance are provided by these organizations:

United States, 1990-91

District response		Extent of supp	ort provided	
District response	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at al
Community organization				
Parent groups	19	44	33	4
Private corporations and businesses	5	22	40	33
Social service agencies	21	48	23	7
Police	42	40	16	2
Civic organizations/service clubs	13	38	35	14
Colleges/universities	2	7	29	62
Religious organizations	4	23	36	37
Type of support				
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention education programs for teachers and/or				
school staff	21	41	25	13
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention education programs for students and			<u>.</u>	
families	18	43	29	10
Sponsoring after-school activities/programs	11	34	33	21
Serving on planning committee/task force	21	37	34	8
Support efforts to increase school safety	20	43	27	9

NOTE: Percents are computed across each row, but may not sum to 100 because of rounding.



Table 10.-Percentage of public school districts indicating that to a great or moderate extent various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drugfree schools, and the percentage indicating that to a great or moderate extent various types of

assistance are provided by these organizations: United States, 1990-91

		E	nrollment si	ze	Lo	cation of dist	rict
District response	Total	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Community organization							
Parent groups	63	60	70	78	60	70	58
Private corporations and businesses	27	23	37	58	41	25	27
Social service agencies	69	66	78	82	90	68	68
Police	82	79	90	98	72	81	83
Civic organizations/service clubs	51	47	63	70	49	53	50
Colleges/universities	9	7	14	29	16	8	9
Religious organizations	27	28	22	23	13	24	30
Type of support							
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention education programs for teachers and/or							
school stafff	62	61	64	64	61	69	58
families	61	59	66	76	73	65	57
Sponsoring after-school activities/programs	45	43	50	56	45	45	45
Serving on planning committee/task force	58	53	77	82	61	66	53
Support efforts to increase school safety	63	61	69	77	49	67	62



Table 11.--Total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for disruptive behavior during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

		Discip	linary action fo	or disruptive b	ehavior	_	
District characteristic		fer to an	Susp	ension	Expulsion		
	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	
All districts	68	2	978	26	21	0.5	
Location of district							
Urban	12	2	306	38	7	0.8	
Suburban	41	3	461	24	8	0.4	
Rural	15	2	210	21	5	0.5	
Enrollment size							
Less than 2,500	7	1	164	18	3	0.3	
2,500 to 9,999	37	4	330	26	7	0.6	
10,000 or more	24	2	484	32	10	0.6	
Region							
Northeast	4	1	161	25	i	0.2	
Central	6	1	227	24	5	0.5	
Southeast	29	5	298	33	5	0.6	
West	29	3	291	24	9	0.7	
Percentage of students							
receiving free or							
reduced-price lunches*							
10 percent or less		1	124	19	1	0.2	
11 to 40 percent		2	516	26	10	0.5	
41 percent or more	30	4	323	31	9	0.8	

^{*}Some districts not did report data on students receiving free lunches; therefore, number of district actions for this characteristic may not sum to number of district actions for all districts.

NOTE: Numbers may not sum to totals because of rounding.



Table 12.--Total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for student alcohol and drug use, possession, or sales, during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

	Discipl	inary action fo	r student alcol	nol and drug u	se, possession,	or sales
District characteristic		er to an ive school	Susp	ension	Ехр	ulsion
	Total (in thousands)	Average 1 number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average ¹ number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average ¹ number of occurrences per 1000 students
All districts	11	0.4	69	1.9	6	0.2
Location of district						
Urban	1	0.2	12	1.7	1	0.2
Suburban	5	0.4	37	1.9	2	0.1
Rural	4	0.7	20	2.0	2	0.2
Enrollment size						
Less than 2,500	3	0.4	18	2.0	1	0.1
2,500 to 9,999	5	0.5	23	1.9	2	0.2
10,000 or more	4	0.3	28	1.9	2	0.2
Region						
Northeast	1	0.2	9	1.6	(+)	()
Central	2	0.3	19	2.0	1	0.1
Southeast	3	0.5	13	1.5	1	0.2
West	5	0.6	28	2.3	3	0.2
Percentage of students						
receiving free or						
reduced-price lunches ²						
10 percent or less	1	0.3	11	1.7	1	0.1
11 to 40 percent		0.5	44	2.2	3	0.2
41 percent or more	3	0.5	14	1.6	2	0.2

^() Less than 0.05.

NOTE: Numbers may not sum to totals because of rounding.



⁽⁺⁾ Less than 500.

¹Means include districts reporting 0 occurrences.

²Some districts not did report data on students receiving free lunches; therefore, number of district actions for this characteristic will not sum to number of district actions for all districts.

Survey Methodology and Data Reliability

Sample Selection

A two-stage sampling process was used to select public school districts for the FRSS District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools. First, a stratified sample of 890 public schools was drawn from the 1988-89 list of public schools compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This file contains about 85,000 listings and is part of the NCES Common Core of Data (CCD) School Universe. Regular, vocational education, and alternative schools in the 50 states and District of Columbia were included in the survey universe, while special education schools were excluded from the frame prior to sampling. Schools not operated by local education agencies and those including only prekindergarten or kindergarten were also excluded. With these exclusions, the final sampling frame consisted of approximately 81,100 eligible schools. The schools were stratified by type of locale (city, urban fringe, town, rural) and level of instruction (elementary, secondary, and combined schools). Within each of the 12 strata, schools were sorted first by state, then district (within each state), and then enrollment size (within each district). Next schools were selected with probabilities proportionate to the square root of the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teachers in the school.

The sampling of schools, in turn, identified the 790 districts to be included in the district survey. Districts comprised of schools that appeared in two or more school strata had multiple chances of selection. The overall probability of selecting a district was approximately proportional to the size of the district.

Response Rates

In mid-April 1991, questionnaires (see Appendix B) were mailed to districts in the sample. Telephone followup of nonrespondents was initiated in late May; data collection was completed by the beginning of July. A response rate of 94 percent (739 districts) was obtained (see Table B). Item nonresponse ranged from 0.0 percent to 2.5 percent.



Table B.--Number of public school districts in the study sample that responded, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic	Sample	Respondents	Response rate
All districts	790	739	0.94
Location of district			
Urban	146	138	0.95
Suburban	364	337	0.93
Rural	280	264	0.94
Enrollment size			
Less than 2,500	285	264	0 93
2,500 to 9,999	272	257	0.94
10,000 or more	233	218	0.94
Region			
Northeast	161	150	0.93
Central	227	210	0.93
Southeast	181	170	0.94
West	221	209	0.95

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 40, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1992.

Sampling and Nonsampling Errors

The response data were weighted to produce national estimates. The weights were designed to adjust for the variable probabilities of selection and differential enrollment. The findings in this report are estimates based on the sample selected and, consequently, are subject to sampling variability.

The survey estimates are also subject to nonsampling errors that can arise because of nonobservation (nonresponse or noncoverage) errors, errors of reporting, and errors made in collection of the data. These errors can sometimes bias the data. Nonsampling errors may include such problems as the differences in the respondents' interpretation of the meaning of the questions; memory effects; misrecording of responses; incorrect editing, coding, and data entry; differences related to the particular time the survey was conducted; or errors in data preparation. While general sampling theory can be used in part to determine how to estimate the sampling variability of a statistic, nonsampling errors are not easy to measure and, for measurement



purposes, usually require that an experiment be conducted as part of the data collection procedures or that data external to the study be used.

To minimize the potential for nonsampling errors, the questionnaire was pretested with superintendents from districts like those that completed the survey. During the design of the survey and the survey pretest, an effort was made to check for consistency of interpretation of questions and to eliminate ambiguous items. The questionnaire and instructions were extensively reviewed by the National Center for Education Statistics, as well as the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the Office of the Undersecretary, and the Drug Planning and Outreach Staff, Office of Elementary/Secondary Education, in the Department of Education. Manual and machine editing of the questionnaires were conducted to check the data for accuracy and consistency. Cases with missing or inconsistent items were recontacted by telephone. Imputations for item nonresponse were not implemented, as item nonresponse rates were less than 5 percent (for most items, nonresponse rates were less than 1 percent). Data were keyed with 100 percent verification.

Variances

The standard error is a measure of the variability of estimates due to sampling. It indicates the variability of a sample estimate that would be obtained from all possible samples of a given design and size. Standard errors can be used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below to 1.96 standard errors above a particular statistic would include the true population parameter being estimated in about 95 percent of the samples. This is a 95 percent confidence interval. For example, the estimated percentage of public school districts that conducted a student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey in the last two years is 61 percent, and the estimated standard error is 2.9 percent. The 95 percent confidence interval for the statistic extends from 61 - (2.9 times 1.96) to 61 + (2.9 times 1.96), or from 55 to 67 percent.

Estimates of standard errors were computed using a technique known as jackknife replication. As with any replication method, jackknife replication involves constructing a number of subsamples (replicates) from the full sample and computing the statistic of interest for each replicate. The mean square error of the replicate estimates around the full sample estimate provides an estimate of the variance of the statistic (e.g., Wolter, 1985, Chapter 4). To construct the replications, 30 stratified subsamples of the full sample were created and then dropped one at



a time to define 30 jackknife replicates (e.g., Wolter, 1985, page 183). A proprietary computer program (WESVAR), available at Westat, Inc., was used to calculate the estimates of standard errors. The software runs under IBM/OS and VAX/VMS systems.

Background Information

The survey was performed under contract with Westat, Inc., using the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). Westat's Project Director was Elizabeth Farris, and the Survey Managers were Wendy Mansfield and Sheila Heaviside. Judi Carpenter was the NCES Project Officer. The data requestor was Mary Frase, Data Development Division, NCES; outside consultants were Oliver Moles, Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and Kimmon Richards, Planning and Evaluation Service, Office of Policy and Planning.

The report was reviewed by Rita Altman, Associate Superintendent, School District of Philadelphia; Floraline Stevens, AERA Fellow, Director of Research and Evaluation, Los Angeles Unified School District; and Alfred Tuchfarber, Institute for Policy Research, University of Cincinnati. Within NCES, report reviewers were John Grymes, Data Development Division, and John Matthews, Education Assessment Division.

For more information about the Fast Response Survey System or the Surveys on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, contact Judi Carpenter, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20208-5651, telephone (202) 219-1333.

References

The WESVAR Procedures. 1989. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Wolter, K. 1985. Introduction to Variance Estimation. Springer-Verlag.



Appendix A Standard Error Tables



Table 1a.—Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts with written policies on general discipline and alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, and percentage of public school districts that have conducted a student alcohol, drug, or tobacco use survey within the last 2 years, by district characteristics:

United States, 1990-91

District characteristic	,	Written policies	š		Conducted student alcohol drug, or tobacco
District Characteristic	General discipline	Alcohol	Drug	Tobacco	use survey in the last two years
All districts	2.3	0.8	0.8	0.9	2.9
Location of district					
Urban	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	11.6
Suburban	0.2	1.1	1.1	2.0	3.5
Rural	3.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	4.3
Enrollment size					
Less than 2,500	2.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	3.8
2,500 to 9,999	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.9	3.4
10,000 or more	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.8	2.8
Region					
Northeast	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.9	7.0
Central	0.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	4.6
Southeast	0.2	1.4	1.4	i.1	5.4
West	5.3	1.2	1.2	1.5	5.5
Percentage of students					
receiving free or					
reduced-price lunches					
10 percent or less	0.3	2.0	2.0	3.6	6.3
11 to 40 percent	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	4.1
41 percent or more	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	6.9



Table 2a.--Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating when their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly, and the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain groups were involved in the development of these policies:

United States, 1990-91

District response	General discipline policy	Alcohol policy*	Drug policy*	Tobacco policy*
ast changed significantly				
Less than 1 year ago	3.1	2.4	2.5	3.4
1-3 years ago	2.9	2.5	2.7	3.0
More than 3 years ago	2.5	1.3	1.3	1.8
Involved in policy development				
State Department of Education	2.8	2.2	2.2	2.6
Principals		2.1	2.1	2.1
Teachers		4.2	1.1	1.2
Parents		2.6	2.2	2.5
Students		3.1	3.1	3.2
		2.4	2.1	2.4
Community groups	∸. /	W		

^{*}At districts where alcohol, drug, and tobasco policies were included in a single policy, respondents were asked to describe each component separately.



Table 3a.--Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that their general discipline, alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies were last changed significantly less than 1 year ago, by district

characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District characteristic	General discipline policy	Alcohol policy	I ,	Tobacco policy
All districts	3.1	2.4	2 5	3.4
ocation of district				
Urban	9.7	10.0	10.0	6.5
Suburban	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.3
Rural	4.4	3.5	3.9	4.6
Enrollment size				
Less than 2,500	3.9	3.3	3.3	4.5
2,500 to 9,999	2.4	2.5	2.8	3.3
10,000 or more	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.5
Region				
Northeast	9.1	6.1	6.9	7.1
Central	5.6	5.2	5.3	5.2
Southeast	5.3	4.8	6.4	5.4
West	4.6	5.2	5.3	5.6
Percentage of students receiving				
free or reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	7.4	4.8	4.9	5.7
11 to 40 percent	3.8	3.8	3.6	4.2
41 percent or more	4.6	5.0	5.7	6.4

Table 4a.—Standard errors of the average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was required in each grade during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

District the share standards	Grade												
District characteristic	К	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
All districts	0.83	0.93	0.91	0.89	1.06	1.08	1.08	1.27	1.16	1.29	1.31	0.98	1.04

Table 5a.--Standard errors of the average number of hours drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education was taught in each grade span during the school year, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

<u> </u>		Grade	span	
School characteristics	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-13
	0.87	1.05	1.14	1.06
All districts	0.67	1.05	1.14	1.00
Location of district				
Urban	2.61	2.36	2.51	2.47
Suburban	1.03	1.14	1.53	1.37
Rural	1.37	1.60	1.69	1.59
Enrollment size				
Less than 2,500	1.14	1.46	1.51	1.40
2,500 to 9,999	1.28	1.52	1.32	1.46
10,000 or more	1.01	2.01	2.52	2.21
Region				
Northeast	2.18	2.53	1.88	? 45
Central	1.45	1.61	2.92	1.74
Southeast	2.93	2.93	3.47	3.52
West	1.43	2.21	1.60	1.92
Percentage of students				
receiving free or				
reduced-price lunches				
10 percent or less	1.81	1.86	1.76	1.53
11 to 40 percent	1.28	1.37	1.51	1.53
41 percent or more	1.71	1.77	2.32	2.68

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System. Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 40, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1991.

24



Table 6a. --Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts offering drug (including alcohol and tobacco) use education through different approaches at each instructional level, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

	Within health curriculum		1	Within science curriculum		As a separate course		Throughout the curriculum			At special assemblies or events				
District characteristic	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High	Elem.	Jr. High	Sr. High
All districts	2.1	1.9	1.4	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.0	2.1	2.4	3.2	3.2	1.9	2.2	2.0
Location of district															
Urhan	13.6	5.9	8.6	11.7	5.3	6.6	10.8	6.1	5.7	15.3	6.3	6.9	3.5	2.7	10.1
Suburban	1.9	2.4	2.1	4.6	2.9	4.1	3.7	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.7	4.2	1.7	2.3	2.5
Rural	3.2	2.7	1.8	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.1	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.9	4.5	3.1	3.0	2.3
Enrollment size															
Less than 2,500	2.7	2.5	1.8	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.3	4.4	4.4	2.4	2.8	2.8
2,500 to 9,999	1.5	2.3	1.9	3.4	2.7	3.5	4.1	2.7	27	3.1	2.9	2.9	1.4	1.3	1.6
10,000 or more	2.7	2.6	1.8	4.1	3.0	3.0	4.1	4.1	3.0	4.3	4.4	4.1	1.8	1.7	1.4
Region															
Northeast	2.2	2.4	2.3	9.0	5.8	6.7	6.3	7.5	3.7	7.0	6.5	6.3	3.1	2.7	2.5
Central	3.5	2.7	2.1	4.3	4.1	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.6	5.6	4.8	3.5	3.8	3.9
Southeast	1.6	2.0	1.6	6.0	3.2	3.2	4.6	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.4	4.5	2.1	1.7	2.1
West	3.9	4.5	4.4	6.6	5.7	6.6	6.2	4.8	5.3	6.4	5.3	7.0	3.3	3.7	3.9
Percentage of students															
receiving free or reduced-															
price lunches				_	. -					F 4	z (5 0	2.8	2.7	2.8
10 percent or less	6.7	2.9	4.1	7.0	5.3	6.2	6.3	5.5	6.8	5.6	5.1	5.9 3.0	2.8 3.2	2.7 3.5	2.9
11 to 40 percent		2.2	1.5	4.5	4.4	3.8	2.7	2.6	2.6	3.0	4,4	3.9			3.0
41 percent or more	2.5	5.5	3.3	7.9	4.5	4.3	5.0	4.5	4.1	5.4	4.6	5.4	2.4	2.3	3.0

SOURCE: Fast Response Survey System, Public School District Survey on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools, FRSS 40, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1992.



25

35

Table 7a.--Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating in how many schools certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities: United States, 1990-

Education program/activities component	All schools	Most schools	Some schools	No schools
Teaching students about causes and effects of				
alcohol, drug, and tobacco use	1.3	1.3	(+)	
Teaching students about laws regarding alcohol.				
drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales,				_
and distribution	2.6	2.1	1.2	0.7
Teaching students to resist peer pressure	1.8	1.7	1.0	
Peer counseling	3.1	1.5	2.7	2.6
School alcohol, drug, and tobacco policy/				
enforcement	2.0	1.6	0.6	1.0
Student assistance programs (SAPs)	2.9	1.1	1.9	3.2
School services for high-risk students	2.5	1.1	1.9	2.1
Referrals to counseling and treatment	1.9	1.5	1.2	0.9
Student drug-testing programs	1.3	9.4	0.8	1.5

⁽⁺⁾ Less than 0.5.



⁻⁻ Estimate of standard error is not derived because it is based on a statistic estimated at 0 percent or at 100 percent.

Table 8a.--Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that certain components are included as part of their drug use education program/activities in all or most schools, by size and location of district: United States, 1990-91

Education program/			Enrollment	size	Location of district			
activities component	Total	Less than 2,500	2,500 to 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Teaching students about causes and effects of								
alcohol, drug, and tobacco use	(+)	-	0.2	~		0.1		
Teaching students about laws regarding alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales,								
and distribution	1.5	1.9	1.9	1.9	0.9	1.3	2.3	
Teaching students to resist peer pressure	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.6	
Peer counseling	3.4	4.1	3.7	3.5	9.8	5.1	4.2	
School alcohol, drug, and tobacco policy/								
enforcement	1.1	1.4	1.7	1.3	1.1	2.2	1.5	
Student assistance programs (SAPs)	2.7	3.6	2.8	3.5	10.6	4.2	3.7	
School services for high-risk students	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.9	16.5	2.8	3.4	
Referrals to counseling and treatment	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.7	16.4	1.8	1.7	
Student drug-testing programs	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.5	5.5	2.3	2.0	

⁽⁺⁾ Less than 0.05.



⁻⁻ Estimate of standard error is not derived because it is based on a statistic estimated at 0 percent or at 100 percent.

Table 9a.—Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating the extent to which various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the extent to which various types of assistance are provided by these organizations: United States, 1990-91

District response		Extent of support provided							
District response	Great extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all					
Community organization									
Parent groups	1.4	3.1	3.0	1.4					
Private corporations and businesses	1.0	2.0	3.2	2.8					
Social service agencies	2.2	2.9	2.8	2.1					
Police	3.4	3.1	2.2	1.0					
Civic organizations/service clubs	1.4	3.1	3.2	2.7					
Colleges/universities	0.7	1.2	2.4	3.0					
Religious organizations	i.2	3.0	2.9	2.3					
Type of support									
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention education programs for teachers and/or school staff	3,3	3.1	2.5	2.2					
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention	3.3	2.1							
education programs for students and		3 5	3.0	2.7					
families	1.6	3.1	3.1	2.6					
Sponsoring after-school activities/programs	2.0		3.7	2.0					
Serving on planning committee/task force	2.4	2.5							
Support efforts to increase school safety	3.2	3 4	3.4	2 :					



Table 10a.--Standard errors of the percentage of public school districts indicating that to a great or moderate extent various organizations in their community provide assistance or educational support to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and the percentage indicating that to a great or moderate extent various types of assistance are provided by these organizations, by size and location of district: United States, 1990-91

		E	rollment si	ze	Location of district			
District response		Less than 2,500	2,500 to 9,999	10,000 or more	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Community organization								
Parent groups	3.1	4.0	2.0	2.8	13.0	3.4	4.6	
Private corporations and businesses	2.3	2.8	2.9	4.3	9.2	3.1	3.3	
Social service agencies	2.7	3.4	2 6	2.7	5.0	3.9	4.1	
Police	2.6	3.4	2.0	0.9	14.4	3.6	3.3	
Civic organizations/service clubs	3.0	3.7	3.5	3 6	9.6	3.8	5.2	
Colleges/universities	1.3	1.6	2.2	3.3	3.0	1.7	2.1	
Religious organizations.	3.1	3.7	2.7	3.5	2.8	3.2	4.7	
Type of support								
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention								
education programs for teachers and/or						_		
school stafff	3.0	3.8	2.9	3.4	11.0	3.6	4.0	
Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention								
education programs for students and								
families	3.1	4 1	2.9	2.3	7.5	4.7	4.4	
Sponsoring after-school activities/programs	3.6	4.4	3.9	5.1	11.0	4.9	4.7	
Serving on planning committee/task force	3.4	4.4	2.9	2.9	14.4	3.8	4.8	
Support efforts to increase school safety	3 1	3.8	3.5	3.9	10.4	4.1	4.9	



Table 11a.--Standard errors of the total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for disruptive behavior during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics: United States, 1990-91

	· '-	Discip	olinary action f	or disruptive b	chavior		
District characteristic	•	er to an ve school	Susp	ension	Expulsion		
	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	
All districts	13.6	0.5	71.4	1.7	2.0	0 05	
Location of district							
Urban	3.5	0.4	55.3	4.5	1.9	0 14	
Suburban	13.4	0.9	51.6	2.2	18	0.08	
Rural	3.2	0.5	36.7	2.7	0.9	0 08	
Enrollment size							
Less than 2,500	1.1	0.2	24.4	2.3	0.5	0 05	
2,500 to 9,999	13.4	1.5	35.1	2.4	1 2	0 09	
10,000 or more	3.8	0.3	52.4	3.2	1.7	0 11	
Region							
Northeast	1.0	0.1	31.6	3.5	0.3	0.04	
Central	0.9	0.1	31.7	2.4	1.1	0.10	
Southeast	12.4	2.0	50.6	3.8	0 9	0.08	
West	7.5	0.6	49.5	2.6	1.9	0.11	
Percentage of students							
receiving free or							
reduced-price lunches							
10 percent or less	0.7	0.1	21.5	2.6	0.4	0.05	
11 to 40 percent	6.0	0.4	44.9	2.1	1.5	0.07	
41 percent or more	12.3	1.6	41.4	3.6	1.7	0 14	



Table 12a. --Standard errors of the total and average number of times certain school actions were taken for student alcohol and drug use, possession, or sale, during the fall 1990 semester, by district characteristics:

United States, 1990-91

	Disciplinary action for student alcohol and drug use, possession, or sales								
District characteristic		fer to an	Susp	ension	Expulsion				
	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students	Total (in thousands)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 students			
All districts	1.2	0.04	6.3	0.17	0.9	0.02			
Location of district									
Urban	0.4	0.05	2.8	0.16	0.3	0.03			
Suburban	0.7	0.04	6.5	0.31	0.7	0.03			
Rural	1.1	0.16	2.5	0.20	0.4	0.04			
Enrollment size									
Less than 2,500	0.8	0.11	2.0	0.21	0.3	0.03			
2,500 to 9,999	0.9	0.09	2.1	0.16	0.5	0.04			
10,000 or more	0 5	0.04	5.4	0.37	0.4	0.03			
Region									
Northeast	0.2	0.04	1.5	0.24	0.1	0. 02			
Central	0.5	0.07	1.8	0.18	0.3	0.03			
Southeast	0.7	0.11	2.1	0.14	0.2	0.02			
West	0.7	0.08	5.8	0.42	0.7	0.06			
Percentage of students									
receiving free or									
reduced-price lunches									
10 percent or less	0 3	0.06	1.9	0.22	0.2	0.03			
11 to 40 percent	0.9	0.06	6.7	0.32	0.7	0.03			
41 percent or more	0.8	0.12	1.9	0.17	0.3	0.03			

Appendix B Questionnaire



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208-5651

FORM APPROVED O.M.B. No.: 1850-0657

EXPIRATION DATE: 12/91

DISTRICT SURVEY ON SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

FAST RESPONSE SURVEY SYSTEM

This survey is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. 1221e-l). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely.

DEFINITIONS FOR THIS SURVEY:

Drug use education refers to learning activities and related policies to prevent or reduce alcohol, drug (e.g., marijuana, inhalants, cocaine), and tobacco use by youth. It does not include clinical treatment or rehabilitation.

Disruptive behavior includes serious and/or unlawful actions that may interfere with order in school (e.g., physical attacks, property destruction, thefts). Alcohol, drug, and tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribution should be reported separately on this questionnaire and not included under "disruptive behavior."

AFFIX LABEL HERE

IF ABOVE INFORMATION IS INCORRECT, PLEASE UPDATE DIRECTLY OF	N LABEL.
Name of Person Completing This Form:	Telephone Number:
Title:	

RETURN COMPLETED FORM TO:

WESTAT, INC. 1650 Research Boulevard Rockville, Maryland 20850

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0657, Washington, D.C. 20503.



NCES Form No. 2379-40, 4/91

	describ	e the compor		- r	,, • · · · · · ,		•		GEN DISCI	ERAL PLINE LICY	A1.C0 <u>POI</u>			RUG LICY		BACCO OLICY
									YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO.
	a.	Does your d			_				1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
	b.	Which of the		_			he									
		1) State De	partmo	ent of E	ducation	n	•••••	••••••	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
		2) Principal							1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
		3) Teachers							1	2	1	2 2	1	2 2	1	2 2 2
		4) Parents							1	2 2	1	2	1	2	1	2
		5) Students							i 1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
		6) Commun 7) Outside		-					1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
	c.	Circle the n			ing whe	n each	of your	policie	es was last	changed	l significa	intly. (If never	changea	i, indicat	e when
		·	•							LESS TI 1 YEAR		1 - YEARS	SAGO		E THAN RS AGO	
		1) General	-	-	-					1		2			3	
		2) Alcohol 3) Drug po								1			2		3	
		4) Tobacco	•							1		2			3	
2.	a.	Circle all gr	rades t	aught in	your di	istrict.			-							
			K	1	2	3	4		5 6	7	8		9	10	11	12
	ь.	What is the the 1990-91 district.)	avera I schoo	ige num ol year?	ber of t (Write	nours di <i>0 for ec</i>	rug (incl ach grad	uding e in w	alcohol an hich it is n	d tobace <i>ot requii</i>	co) use e red; write	ducatic <i>NA fo</i>	m is req <i>r each g</i>	uired in rade noi	each gr offered	in you
		GRADE H	ours		(;	RADE	HOU	RS	G	RADE	HOUR	S		GRADE	Ю	URS
		к				4				7				10		
		1				5				8 .				11		
		2				6.				9 .				12		
		3														
	c.	In which of	the fo	ollowing	ways do	school	s in you	r distri	et offer dr	ug (inclu	iding alco	ohol an	d tobacc	co) use 6	ducation	n?
			WIT	THIN	wi1	HIN	AS	i A			AT S	PECIAI.				
			HEA	ATH	SCH	ENCE	SEPA	RATE		GHOUT		MBLIES				
			CURRI	<u>CULUM</u>	CURRI	CULUM	<u>cot</u>	'RSE_	THE CURI	RICULU <u>N</u>	1 ORF	<u>VENTS</u>		Ω	THER	
			YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	S NO		(SI	PECIFY)	
	Flem	entary	1	2	1	2	i	2	1	2	1	2				
		r high		2	1	2 2 2	1	2 2	ì	2	1	2 2 2				
		r high		2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2				
								3.		44						
(3)								36		4 4						



1.

	their				LL OOLS	MOST SCHOOLS	SOME SCHOOLS	NO SCHOOLS
	a.	Teaching students about causes and effects and tobacco use		-	1	2	3	4
	ъ.	Teaching students about laws regarding alc	ohol, drug, ar	ıd	_			A
		tobacco use, possession, sales, and distribut			1	2 2	3	4
	c.	Teaching students skills to resist peer press			1	2	3 3	4
	d.	Peer counseling			1	2		4
	e.	School alcohol, drug, and tobacco policy/er			i 1	2	3 3	4
	f.	Student assistance programs (SAPs)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	••••••	1	2	3	4
	g.	School services for high-risk students			1	2	3	4
	h .	Referrals to counseling and treatment			1	2	3	4
	1.	Student drug-testing programs			1	2	3	4
	J.	Other (specify)		••••••	1	2	3	4
		your district conducted a student alcohol, dru	_	•				
		e the number indicating the extent to which ational support to promote safe, disciplined, a			anizatio	ns in your	district provi	des assistance
	0000	ational support to promote vale, amarpinous, t	GREAT	MODERATE	SMA	NLL	NOT	
			EXTENT	EXTENT	EXT	ENT	AT ALL	
	a.	Parent groups	1	2	3	}	4	
	b.	Private corporations and businesses	1	2	3	}	4	
	c.	Social service agencies	1	2	3	3	4	
	d.	Police	1	2	3	3	4	
	e.	Civic organizations/service clubs	1	2	3	3	4	
	f.	Colleges/universities	1	2	3		4	
	g.	Religious organizations	1	2	3		4	
		e the number indicating to what extent the	above grour	os provide supi	port to	promote sa	ife, discipline	d. and drug-f
	scho	-	anne gener					
				GREAT		DERATE	SMALL	NOT
				EXTENT	E	XTENT	EXTENT	AT ALL
	a.	Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention ed				_	_	_
		programs for teachers and/or school staff.		i		2	3	4
	b.	Sponsoring alcohol and drug prevention ec					_	_
		programs for students and families		1		2	3	4
	c.	Sponsoring after-school activities/program		1		2	3	4
	d.	Serving on planning committee/task force		1		2	3	4
	e.	Supporting efforts to increase school safety	Y	1		2	3	4
-	How	many times were the following actions take hol and drug use, possession, or sales? ("Tim	n in your dist	trict in the fall	1990 se	mester for	disruptive be	havior or stud
	aicoi	not and utug use, possession, or sales: (Tim	es rejers to m	imizer of meme.			MES ACTIONS	
								OLAND DRUG
						RUPTIVE		POSSESSION,
		Transfer to an alternative school Jurite NA	if alternative		BEI	LAVIOR	O	R SALES
	a.	Transfer to an alternative school (write NA schools are not available)	_					
	L							
	b. ¢.	Suspension Expulsion						
	_	htain an approximate socioeconomic measur			hetter			
	100	pret the data of this survey, please indicate the	e ioi youi bisi w nervent of e	andente in vou	r ive ttel			
	inter	pret the data of this survey, please indicate the ict currently receiving federally funded free o	a percent of s	acuucina iii you!	1		%	
	1.	file aggregation of the first and a state of the state of the state of the first state of						







United States
Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208–5651

Official Business Penalty for Private Use, \$300 Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G-17

FOURTH CLASS BOOK RATE



